

product produced by the method of claim 3 and by the method of claim 6 respectively. Claims 8 and 9 were amended merely by added essentially verbatim the language of the methods of claims 3 and 6 respectively. It follows that claims 7 and 8 were not amended and, hence, there could be nothing in these claims which required new search and/or consideration. If the finality of the rejection is not withdrawn or if this amendment is not entered for purposes of allowance or appeal, a Petition requesting such action will be filed.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected for the first time under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai (U.S. 5,841,174) in view of Watabe et al.(4,727,038). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8 and 9 require, among other steps, after forming the gate structure, then performing a lateral growth step on the gate dielectric to increase the thickness of the gate dielectric at the corners of the gate, but not under central regions of the gate. The advantages derived by the claimed structure are increased gate conductivity, additional control over gate corner profiles, additional control over gate electric fields, additional control over silicided gate structures and additional control over the line-to-space ratio of the gate pattern, while using conventional processes.

In view of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jay M. Cantor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jay M. Cantor

Reg. No. 19906

(202) 639-7713